

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 and 31-33 are pending. Claims 2, 5-7, 12-17, and 22 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, 19-21, and 31-33 have been canceled. Claims 34-42 have been added. The amendments are supported in the Specification as filed at least on page 17, lines 8-10; page 19, lines 18-21; and page 20, lines 4-7. No new matter has been added. The rejections of the claims are respectfully traversed in light of the amendments and following remarks and allowance of the application is requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants' attorney wishes to express his appreciation to Examiners Duong and Winder for the courtesy of conducting a telephone interview regarding this application on June 22, 2004. The claims have been amended in light of the interview and discussion regarding the references of record, in particular U.S. Patent No. 6,314,409 to Schneck et al. (hereinafter "Schneck"), and certain non-obvious and unanticipated features of the present invention. In particular, the Examiners indicated the allowability of Claims 17 and 22 as amended in this Response to Final Office Action, noting that the references of record do not disclose or suggest "providing an intercept application which intercepts an editing user action of a digital object sent from a hosting application to a document server application" in combination with the other elements of respective Claims 17 and 22.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12, 14-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,409 hereinafter "Schneck").

As noted above, Claims 17 and 22 have been amended into an allowable form based upon the interview with Examiners Duong and Winder.

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, and 19-21 have been canceled. Claims 2, 5-7, 12, and 14-15 have been amended to depend from amended Claim 17 and contain additional limitations that further distinguish them from Schneck. Therefore, Claims 2, 5-7, 12, and 14-15 are patentable over Schneck for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 17.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck in

LAW OFFICES OF
MICHAELSON KWOK
CHEN & BEID LLP

2402 MICHELSON DR.
SUITE 310
OAKVINE, CA 92612
(949) 732-7040
FAX (949) 752-7049

v1

-7-

Serial No. 09/620,781

view of Rosborough et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,754 hereinafter "Rosborough").

Rosborough discloses that their invention is directed toward "measurement of response time in computer applications and . . . the use of non-intrusive devices to measure response time." (Rosborough, col.1 lines 14-17). Rosborough does not remedy the deficiencies of Schneck noted above.

Claim 6 has been amended to depend from Claim 17 and contains additional limitations that further distinguish it from Schneck in view of Rosborough. Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable over Schneck in view of Rosborough for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 17.

Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck in view of Ramstrom et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,004 hereinafter "Ramstrom").

Ramstrom discloses that their invention is directed toward "telecommunication exchanges and, more particularly, to a software architecture for use in a stored program controlled telecommunications switching system." (Ramstrom, col.1 lines 15-18). Ramstrom does not remedy the deficiencies of Schneck noted above.

Claims 13 and 16 have been amended to depend from Claim 17 and contain additional limitations that further distinguish them from Schneck in view of Ramstrom. Therefore, Claims 13 and 16 are patentable over Schneck in view of Ramstrom for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 17.

Claims 17-18 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck in view of Knapton, III (U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,486 hereinafter "Knapton"). Knapton does not remedy the deficiencies of Schneck noted above, and Claims 17 and 22 have been amended into an allowable form based upon the interview with Examiners Duong and Winder.

Claims 18 and 23 are dependent on Claims 17 and 22, respectively, and contain additional limitations that further distinguish them from Schneck in view of Knapton. Therefore, Claims 18 and 23 are patentable over Schneck in view of Knapton for at least the same reasons provided above for Claims 17 and 22, respectively.

LAW OFFICES OF
McPHERSON KNOX
GREEN & HEID LLP

1403 MICHELSON DR.
SUITE 210
IRVINE, CA 92612
(949) 752-7040
FAX (949) 752-7049

v1

-8-

Serial No. 09/620,781

New Claims

New Claims 34-42 are dependent upon Claim 22 and contain additional limitations that further distinguish them from the references of record. Therefore, Claims 34-42 are patentable over the references of record for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 22.

LAW OFFICES OF
MICHERSON KWOK
CHEN & BEID LLP

1103 MICHELSON DR.
SUITE 210
IRVING, CA 92612
(949) 752-7040
FAX (949) 752-7049

v1

-9-

Serial No. 09/620,781

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicants believe pending Claims 2, 5-7, 12-18, 22-23, and 34-42 are now in condition for allowance and allowance of the application is hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, the Examiner is hereby requested to telephone Applicants' Attorney at (949) 752-7040.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Tina Kavanagh
Tina Kavanagh

June 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Park

David S. Park
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 52,094

LAW OFFICES OF
NELSON KWOK
CHEN & YEED LLP

1402 MICHELSON DR.
SUITE 210
IRVINE, CA 92614
(949) 752-7040
FAX (949) 752-7049

v1

-10-

Serial No. 09/620,781